

Application No. 10/622,013

Filed: July 17, 2003

TC Art Unit: 1724

Confirmation No.: 1697

REMARKS

Claims 15-27 are allowed. Claim 3 has been objected to.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 11-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Matuda et al. in view of Dargel. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a sheet of filter media comprising a laminate of two or more nonwoven polymer materials, and the top and bottom edge bands of the frame comprise one of the nonwoven polymer materials. The laminate structure is advantageous to provide a combination of greater filtration efficiency and stiffness.

Matuda does not disclose, teach, or suggest such a laminate structure for the filter member 12. Matuda discloses only a filter member 12 formed from a non-woven fabric of thermoplastic polymeric material, preferably of polypropylene fibers (col. 4, lines 58-67). Similarly, Dargel does not disclose, teach, or suggest the recited laminate structure for a filter. Dargel discloses various sheets of polypropylene between two metal gratings (col. 2, lines 33-43). Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentable thereover.

Claim 8 has been rejected under § 103(a) over Matuda et al. and Dargel and further in view of Johnson. Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under § 103(a) over Matuda et al. Dargel, and Johnson, and further in view of Hirano et al. These claims are believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 and accordingly no further comment thereon is believed necessary at this time.

-10-

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,  
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP  
TEL. (617) 542-2290

Application No. 10/622,013

Filed: July 17, 2003

TC Art Unit: 1724

Confirmation No.: 1697

New independent claim 28 is similar to original claim 1 and incorporates a portion of claim 3. In particular, claim 28 recites a frame comprising a top edge band and a bottom edge band, the top edge band and the bottom edge band comprising a nonwoven spun bond polyester material. The spun bond polyester material is advantageous because it is a stiffer material, suitable for a frame.

Neither Matuda nor Dargel disclose, teach, or suggest a frame of nonwoven spun bond polyester material. Matuda discloses a member 16 of a mixture of melt-blown polypropylene microfibers and crimped staple fibers of polyester, and a holding member 14 of acrylic or other material that can fuse with the member 16 (col. 5, lines 11-20, lines 31-40). Dargel discloses a frame 90 of polypropylene (col. 3, lines 17-19). Accordingly, claim 28 is also believed to be patentable thereover.

New dependent claims 29-41 are similar to dependent claims 2-14. These claims are believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth with respect to claim 28.

Application No. 10/622,013

Filed: July 17, 2003

TC Art Unit: 1724

Confirmation No.: 1697

In view of the above amendments and remarks, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and indication thereof are respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENT MERTZ ET AL.

By: 

Beverly E. North

Registration No. 32,033

Attorney for Applicants

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,

GAGNEBIN &amp; LEOVICI LLP

Ten Post Office Square

Boston, MA 02109

Telephone: (617) 542-2290

Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

BEH/dkh/307114

-12-

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,  
GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP  
TEL: (617) 542-2290  
FAX: (617) 451-0313